

development, and/or surrounding business complex known as:

1

#### I. SUMMARY

2

1.] This is a civil rights action by plaintiff Sandi Rush ("Rush") for discrimination at the building, structure, facility, complex, property, land,

4

6

7

5 San Marcos Stadium 18

1180 West San Marcos Boulevard

San Marcos, CA 92078

(hereafter referred to as "the Theater")

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

Rush seeks damages, injunctive and declaratory relief, attorney fees and costs, against: Regal Cinemas, Inc. dba San Marcos Stadium 18; Gibraltar San Marcos S, LLC; San Marcos Edwards 13, LLC; San Marcos Edwards 21, LLC; San Marcos Edwards 22, LLC; San Marcos Edwards 23, LLC; San Marcos Edwards 24, LLC; San Marcos Edwards 25, LLC; San Marcos Edwards 26, LLC; San Marcos Edwards 27, LLC; San Marcos Edwards 28, LLC; San Marcos Edwards 29, LLC; San Marcos Edwards 30, LLC (hereafter collectively referred to as "San Marcos Stadium 18") pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, (42 U.S.C. §§ 12101 et seq.), and related California statutes.

18

#### II. JURISDICTION

20

19

3. This Court has original jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343 for ADA claims.

2122

4. Supplemental jurisdiction for claims brought under parallel California law—arising from the same nucleus of operative facts—is predicated on 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

2324

5. Rush's claims are authorized by 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

25

#### III. VENUE

2627

6. All actions complained of herein take place within the jurisdiction of the United States District Court, Southern District of California, and venue is

28

invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), (c).

Rush v. Regal Cinemas, Inc. dba San Marcos Stadium 18, et al. Plaintiff's Complaint

2

4 5

7

8

9

6

10

12

13

11

14

1516

17

18

19 20

21

2223

24

2526

27

28

IV. PARTIES

- 7.3 San Marcos Stadium 18 owns, operates, and/or leases the Theater, and consists of a person (or persons), firm, and/or corporation.
- 8. Rush is a paraplegic who is unable to walk or stand, and requires the use of a wheelchair when traveling about in public. Consequently, Rush is "physically disabled," as defined by all applicable California and United States laws, and a member of the public whose rights are protected by these laws.

#### V. FACTS

- 9. The Theater is a place of exhibition or entertainment, open to the public, which is intended for nonresidential use and whose operation affects commerce.
- 10. Rush visited the Theater and encountered barriers (both physical and intangible) that interfered with—if not outright denied—her ability to use and enjoy the goods, services, privileges, and accommodations offered at the facility. To the extent known by Rush, the barriers at the Theater included, but are not limited to, the following:
  - The signage at the van accessible parking spaces is incorrect;
  - The parking spaces have slopes and cross slopes that exceed 2.0%;
  - The access aisles have slopes and cross slopes that exceed 2.0% due to the encroaching built-up curb ramp;
  - The ramp leading from the disabled parking spaces has handrails that are obstructed by the mounting brackets;
  - The ramp leading from the individual theatre's door to the seating area has hand rails that are obstructed by the mounting brackets;
  - None of the water closet stalls are designated as being accessible to the disabled;
  - The soap dispensers are mounted outside of the required reach range limits;

Rush v. Regal Cinemas, Inc. dba San Marcos Stadium 18, et al. Plaintiff's Complaint

- The pipes beneath the lavatories are improperly and incompletely wrapped;
- There is insufficient clear knee space beneath the middle lavatory (of each set of lavatories);
- There is insufficient strike side clearance when exiting the restroom; Restroom Stall No. 1 (wider stall):
  - There is no handle mounted below the water closet stall door lock;
  - The toilet tissue dispenser is more than 12 inches from the front of the water closet;
- The disposable seat cover dispenser is more than 40 inches from the floor; Restroom Stall No. 2 (narrower stall):
  - There is no handle mounted below the water closet stall door lock;
  - The toilet tissue dispenser is more than 12 inches from the front of the water closet; and,
  - The disposable seat cover dispenser is more than 40 inches from the floor. These barriers prevented Rush from enjoying full and equal access.
- 11. Rush was also deterred from visiting the Theater because she knew that the Theater's goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, and accommodations were unavailable to physically disabled patrons (such as herself). She continues to be deterred from visiting the Theater because of the future threats of injury created by these barriers.
- 12. Rush also encountered barriers at the Theater, which violate state and federal law, but were unrelated to her disability. Nothing within this complaint, however, should be construed as an allegation that Rush is seeking to remove barriers unrelated to her disability.
- 13. San Marcos Stadium 18 knew that these elements and areas of the Theater were inaccessible, violate state and federal law, and interfere with (or deny) access to the physically disabled. Moreover, San Marcos Stadium 18 has Rush v. Regal Cinemas, Inc. dba San Marcos Stadium 18, et al. Plaintiff's Complaint

8<sup>.</sup> 

•

physically disabled. To date, however, San Marcos Stadium 18 refuses to either remove those barriers or seek an unreasonable hardship exemption to excuse non-compliance.

14. At all relevant times, San Marcos Stadium 18 has possessed and

the financial resources to remove these barriers from San Marcos Stadium 18

(without much difficulty or expense), and make the Theater accessible to the

- 14. At all relevant times, San Marcos Stadium 18 has possessed and enjoyed sufficient control and authority to modify the Theater to remove impediments to wheelchair access and to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines and Title 24 regulations. San Marcos Stadium 18 has not removed such impediments and has not modified the Theater to conform to accessibility standards. San Marcos Stadium 18 has intentionally maintained the Theater in its current condition and has intentionally refrained from altering the Theater so that it complies with the accessibility standards.
- 15. Rush further alleges that the (continued) presence of barriers at the theater is so obvious as to establish San Marcos Stadium 18's discriminatory intent. On information and belief, Rush avers that evidence of this discriminatory intent includes San Marcos Stadium 18's refusal to adhere to relevant building standards; disregard for the building plans and permits issued for the Theater; conscientious decision to the architectural layout (as it currently exists) at the Theater; decision not to remove barriers from the Theater; and allowance that San Marcos Stadium 18's property continues to exist in its non-compliant state. Rush further alleges, on information and belief, that San Marcos Stadium 18 is not in the midst of a remodel, and that the barriers present at the Theater are not isolated (or temporary) interruptions in access due to maintenance or repairs.

Id.; 28 C.F.R. § 36.211(b)

Rush v. Regal Cinemas, Inc. dba San Marcos Stadium 18, et al. Plaintiff's Complaint

# VI. FIRST CLAIM

# Denial of "Full and Equal" Enjoyment and Use

Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990

 16. Rush incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 15 for this claim.

17. Title III of the ADA holds as a "general rule" that no individual shall be discriminated against on the basis of disability in the full and equal enjoyment (or use) of goods, services, facilities, privileges, and accommodations offered by any person who owns, operates, or leases a place of public accommodation. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a).

18. San Marcos Stadium 18 discriminated against Rush by denying "full and equal enjoyment" and use of the goods, services, facilities, privileges or

Failure to Remove Architectural Barriers in an Existing Facility

accommodations of the Theater during each visit and each incident of deterrence.

19. The ADA specifically prohibits failing to remove architectural barriers, which are structural in nature, in existing facilities where such removal is readily achievable. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv). The term "readily achievable" is defined as "easily accomplishable and able to be carried out without much difficulty or expense." Id. § 12181(9).

20. When an entity can demonstrate that removal of a barrier is not readily achievable, a failure to make goods, services, facilities, or accommodations available through alternative methods is also specifically prohibited if these methods are readily achievable. <u>Id.</u> § 12182(b)(2)(A)(v).

21. Here, Rush alleges that San Marcos Stadium 18 can easily remove the architectural barriers at Theater without much difficulty or expense, and that San Marcos Stadium 18 violated the ADA by failing to remove those barriers, when it was readily achievable to do so.

Rush v. Regal Cinemas, Inc. dba San Marcos Stadium 18, et al.
Plaintiff's Complaint

8

11 12

13

14 15

17

16

18 19

20 21

22

23 24

25 26

27

28

22. In the alternative, if it was not "readily achievable" for San Marcos Stadium 18 to remove the Theater's barriers, then San Marcos Stadium 18 violated the ADA by failing to make the required services available through alternative methods, which are readily achievable.

# Failure to Design and Construct an Accessible Facility

- 23. On information and belief, the Theater was designed or constructed (or both) after January 26, 1992—independently triggering access requirements under Title III of the ADA.
- The ADA also prohibits designing and constructing facilities for first occupancy after January 26, 1993, that aren't readily accessible to, and usable by, individuals with disabilities when it was structurally practicable to do so. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(1).
- 25. Here, San Marcos Stadium 18 violated the ADA by designing or constructing (or both) the Theater in a manner that was not readily accessible to the physically disabled public—including Rush—when it was structurally practical to do so.<sup>2</sup>

# Failure to Make an Altered Facility Accessible

- On information and belief, the Theater was modified after January 26. 26, 1992, independently triggering access requirements under the ADA.
- The ADA also requires that facilities altered in a manner that affects 27. (or could affect) its usability must be made readily accessible to individuals with disabilities to the maximum extent feasible. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2). Altering an area that contains a facility's primary function also requires adding making the paths of travel, bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving that area accessible to the maximum extent feasible. Id.

Nothing within this Complaint should be construed as an allegation that plaintiff is bringing this action as a private attorney general under either state or federal statutes. Rush v. Regal Cinemas, Inc. dba San Marcos Stadium 18, et al. Plaintiff's Complaint

10 11

9

12 13

14 15

16 17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27

28

28. Here, San Marcos Stadium 18 altered the Theater in a manner that violated the ADA and was not readily accessible to the physically disabled public—including Rush—to the maximum extent feasible.

# Failure to Modify Existing Policies and Procedures

- The ADA also requires reasonable modifications in policies, 29. practices, or procedures, when necessary to afford such goods, services, facilities, or accommodations to individuals with disabilities, unless the entity can demonstrate that making such modifications would fundamentally alter their nature. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii).
- Here, San Marcos Stadium 18 violated the ADA by failing to make 30. reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures at the Theater, when these modifications were necessary to afford (and would not fundamentally alter the nature of) these goods, services, facilities, or accommodations.
- Rush seeks all relief available under the ADA (i.e., injunctive relief, 31. attorney fees, costs, legal expense) for these aforementioned violations. 42 U.S.C. § 12205.
- Rush also seeks a finding from this Court (i.e., declaratory relief) 32. that Sari Marcos Stadium 18 violated the ADA in order to pursue damages under California's Unruh Civil Rights Act or Disabled Persons Act.

#### VII. SECOND CLAIM

# **Disabled Persons Act**

- Rush incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 33. 30 for this claim.
- California Civil Code § 54 states, in part, that: Individuals with 34. disabilities have the same right as the general public to the full and free use of the streets, sidewalks, walkways, public buildings and facilities, and other public places.

- 35. California Civil Code § 54.1 also states, in part, that: Individuals with disabilities shall be entitled to full and equal access to accommodations, facilities, telephone facilities, places of public accommodation, and other places to which the general public is invited.
- 36. Both sections specifically incorporate (by reference) an individual's rights under the ADA. See Civil Code §§ 54(c) and 54.1(d).
- 37. Here, San Marcos Stadium 18 discriminated against the physically disabled public—including Rush—by denying them full and equal access to the Theater. The San Marcos Stadium 18 also violated Rush's rights under the ADA, and, therefore, infringed upon or violated (or both) Rush's rights under the Disabled Persons Act.
- 38. <u>For each offense</u> of the Disabled Persons Act, Rush seeks actual damages (both general and special damages), statutory minimum damages of one thousand dollars (\$1,000), declaratory relief, and any other remedy available under California Civil Code § 54.3.
- 39. She also seeks to enjoin San Marcos Stadium 18 from violating the Disabled Persons Act (and ADA) under California Civil Code § 55, and to recover reasonable attorneys' fees and incurred under California Civil Code §§ 54.3 and 55.

#### VIII. THIRD CLAIM

# **Unruh Civil Rights Act**

- 40. Rush incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 30 for this claim.
- 41. California Civil Code § 51 states, in part, that: All persons within the jurisdiction of this state are entitled to the full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges, or services in all business establishments of every kind whatsoever.

5

11

12

10

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24

26

25

27 28

- California Civil Code § 51.5 also states, in part, that: No business establishment of any kind whatsoever shall discriminate against any person in this state because of the disability of the person.
- California Civil Code § 51(f) specifically incorporates (by 43. reference) an individual's rights under the ADA into the Unruh Act.
- San Marcos Stadium 18's aforementioned acts and omissions denied 44. Rush-full and equal public—including disabled physically the accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges and services in a business establishment (because of their physical disability).
- These acts and omissions (including the ones that violate the ADA) 45. denied, aided or incited a denial, or discriminated against Rush by violating the Unruh Act.
- Rush was damaged by San Marcos Stadium 18's wrongful conduct, 46. and seeks statutory minimum damages of four thousand dollars (\$4,000) for each offense.
- Rush also seeks to enjoin San Marcos Stadium 18 from violating the 47. Unruh Act (and ADA), and recover reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred under California Civil Code § 52(a).

# IX. FOURTH CLAIM

# **Denial of Full and Equal Access to Public Facilities**

- Rush incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 48. 13 for this claim.
- Health and Safety Code § 19955(a) states, in part, that: California 49. public accommodations or facilities (built with private funds) shall adhere to the provisions of Government Code § 4450.
- Health and Safety Code § 19959 states, in part, that: Every existing 50. (non-exempt) public accommodation constructed prior to July 1, 1970, which is altered or structurally repaired, is required to comply with this chapter.

Rush v. Regal Cinemas, Inc. dba San Marcos Stadium 18, et al. Plaintiff's Complaint

Page 10

- 51. Rush alleges the Theater is a public accommodation constructed, altered, or repaired in a manner that violates Part 5.5 of the Health and Safety Code or Government Code § 4450 (or both), and that the Theater was not exempt under Health and Safety Code § 19956.
- 52. San Marcos Stadium 18's non-compliance with these requirements at the Theater aggrieved (or potentially aggrieved) Rush and other persons with physical disabilities. Accordingly, she seeks injunctive relief and attorney fees pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 19953.

### X. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Rush prays judgment against San Marcos Stadium 18 for:

- 1. Injunctive relief, preventive relief, or any other relief the Court deems proper.
- 2. Declaratory relief that San Marcos Stadium 18 violated the ADA for the purpose's of Unruh Act or Disabled Persons Act damages.
- 3. Statutory minimum damages under either sections 52(a) or 54.3(a) of the California Civil Code (but not both) according to proof.
- 4. Attorneys' fees, litigation expenses, and costs of suit.<sup>3</sup>
- Interest at the legal rate from the date of the filing of this action.

20 DATED: June 21, 2010

DISABLED ADVOCACY GROUP, APLC

LYNN HUBBARD, III
Attorney for Plaintiff

This includes attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

Rush v. Regal Cinemas, Inc. dba San Marcos Stadium 18, et al.

Plaintiff's Complaint

SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07)	į	_	OVER SHEET		ILEU
The JS 44 civil cover sheet and by local rules of court. This for the civil docket sheet. (SEE I	d the information contained orm, approved by the Judici NSTRUCTIONS ON THE RE	herein neither replace nor al Conference of the Unite VERSE OF THE FORM.)	supplement the filing and served States in September 1974, is	ice of pleadings or other papers as s required for the use of the Cleich	required by law, except as provided Court of his purpose of initialing
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDAN	TS TO THE STATE OF	
SANDI RUSH			SEE ATTACH	CLERK U	S. DISTRICT COURT
SANDI RUSH	•		SEE ATTACK	SOUTHERN D	ISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA DEP <b>UTY</b>
• •	e of First Listed Plaintiff  EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF	SAN DIEGO	County of Reside	nce of First Listed Defendant	S ONI A)
				LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, U AND INVOLVED.	,
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	e, Address, and Telephone Num	•	Attorneys (If Kno		6 10110
YNN HUBBARD, III 2 Williamsburg Lane	DISABLED ADVOC Chico, CA 95926		THE	'10 CV 1317	H WVG
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only) III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff					
U.S. Government Plaintiff	■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government	nt Not a Party)	(For Diversity Cases O Citizen of This State	only)  PTF DEF  □ 1 □ 1 Incorporated or F  of Business In The	
🗇 2 U.S. Government	☐ 4 Diversity		Citizen of Another State	☐ 2 ☐ 2 Incorporated and	Principal Place 🗂 5 🗍 5
Defendant	(Indicate Citizen	ship of Parties in Item III)	Citizen or Subject of a	of Business In	Another State
	Ļ		Foreign Country		
IV. NATURE OF SU			Resel estad delthid e/dena t	ATY SECTION BANKRUPTOY	A PERSONAL PROPERTY OF THE PRO
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgmen ☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise ☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability ☐ 290 All Other Real Property	Slander  330 Federal Employers' Liability  340 Marine  345 Marine Product Liability  350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability	S10 Motions to Vacat Sentence Habeas Corpus: 530 General 535 Death Penalty 640 Mandamus & Otl	620 Other Food & Drug     625 Drug Related Seizur     635 Drug Related Seizur     630 Liquor Laws     640 R.R. & Truck     650 Airline Regs.     660 Occupational     Safety/Health     690 Other     710 Fair Labor Standards     720 Labor/Mgmt. Relatic     730 Labor/Mgmt. Report     8 Disclosure Act     740 Railway Labor Act     790 Other Labor Litigatic     791 Empl. Ret. Inc.     Security Act     620 Other Food & Drug     620 Other Food & Drug     630 Drug Regs.     640 Other Labor Standards     640 Railway Labor Act     640 Railw		470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations   480 Consumer Credit   490 Cable/Sat TV   810 Selective Service   850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange   875 Customer Challenge   12 USC 3410   890 Other Statutory Actions   891 Agricultural Acts
□ 2 R	an "X" in One Box Only) temoved from 3 tate Court	Appellate Court	Reopened a	Transferred from 6 Multidis Inother district Specify)	n Judgment
VI. CAUSE OF ACT	ON Brief description of	cause.	re filing (Do not cite jurisdic 	ctional statutes unless diversity):	
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		IS IS A CLASS ACTION			y if demanded in complaint: D: ☐ Yes ☑ No
VIII. RELATED CAS	SE(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE 06/21/2010	i o prisina	SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY OF RECORD		
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT # \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	AMOUNT \$355 6	122 (10 BH APPLYING IFP	JUDO	GE MAG. JU	JDGE
1.					

# **DEFENDANT LIST**

- 1. REGAL CINEMAS, INC. dba SAN MARCOS STADIUM 18;
- 2. GIBRALTAR SAN MARCOS S, LLC;
- 3. SAN MARCOS EDWARDS 13, LLC;
- 4. SAN MARCOS EDWARDS 21, LLC;
- 5. SAN MARCOS EDWARDS 22, LLC;
- 6. SAN MARCOS EDWARDS 23, LLC;
- 7. SAN MARCOS EDWARDS 24, LLC;
- 8. SAN MARCOS EDWARDS 25, LLC;
- 9. SAN MARCOS EDWARDS 26, LLC;
- 10.SAN MARCOS EDWARDS 27, LLC;
- 11.SAN MARCOS EDWARDS 28, LLC;
- 12.SAN MARCOS EDWARDS 29, LLC;
- 13.SAN MARCOS EDWARDS 30, LLC

Court Name: USDC California Southern

Division: 3

Receipt Number: CAS014880 Cashier ID: bhartman

Transaction Date: 06/22/2010 Payer Name: LYNN HUBBARD

CIVIL FILING FEE

For: RUSH V REGAL CINEMAS ET AL Case/Party: D-CAS-3-10-CV-001317-001

: Amount: \$350.00

CREDIT CARD

Amt Tendered: \$350.00

Total Due: \$350.00 Total Tendered: \$350.00

Change Amt: \$0.00

There will be a fee of \$45.00 charged for any returned check.